

REMARKS

Claims 6-12 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claim 6 is amended for better clarity, and claims 1-5 and 13 are canceled. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below for a personal interview before issuing a subsequent rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the personal interview be conducted between Applicants' representative, Examiner Vu, and Examiner Vu's supervisor.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the references listed on, and to return an initialed copy of, the Form PTO-1449 submitted with the February 2, 2006 Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner is also respectfully requested to return an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 submitted with the November 9, 2005 Amendment. The Office Action indicates, on the Official Action summary page, an initialed copy of the November 9, 2005 Form PTO-1449 is attached. However, such an attachment is not enclosed with the Office Action. In particular, the November 9, 2005 Form PTO-1449 lists U.S. Patent No. 6,290,360 to Konuma et al. that is applied in the August 9, 2005 Office Action, but is not listed on a Form PTO-892 or submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement. (See the November 9, 2005 Amendment for the initial request for listing U.S. Patent No. 6,290,360 in a Form PTO-892 or Form PTO-1449.)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,375,328 to Hashizume et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,891,104 to Dinh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,439,299 to Miyahara et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,659,168 to Barsun; and rejects claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hashizume in view of Dinh

in view of Miyahara in view of Barsun and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,354 to Menard. These rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-5 and 13.

The Office Action rejects claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hashizume in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,290,360 to Konuma and further in view of Menard; and rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hashizume in view of Menard and Konuma and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0060779 to Furuhashi et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 is amended to recite "the different shape depending on a type of incident light or a position of the second case relative to at least one of the optical system or the projection optical system." The applied references do not disclose or suggest these additional features.

In particular, the Office Action acknowledges that Hashizume does not disclose or suggest a first case that contains at least one of the electro-optical units; and a second case having a different shape compared to the first case that contains at least one of the electro-optical units not contained in the first case, as recited in claim 6. However, the Office Action asserts that Konuma discloses a heat sink placed to one side of a projection unit, and Menard discloses a surface area increasing portion for heat dissipation. Thus, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to add Menard's surface area increasing portion and Konuma's heat sink to Hashizume's device.

However, both Konuma and Menard are directed to heat dissipation. Konuma and Menard do not disclose or suggest optical systems. Thus, Konuma's and Menard's heat dissipation configurations do not disclose or suggest "the different shape depending on a type of incident light or a position of the second case relative to at least one of the optical system or the projection optical system," as recited in claim 6. Thus, Konuma and Menard do not supply the subject matter lacking in Hashizume.

Furuhata does not disclose or suggest "the different shape depending on a type of incident light or a position of the second case relative to at least one of the optical system or the projection optical system." Thus, Furuhata does not supply the subject matter lacking in Hashizume. Therefore, Hashizume, Konuma, Menard and Furuhata, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 6, and claims 7-12 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 6-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/sqb

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: March 23, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
